

Coburn Amendment # 2716

Fully Funding the President's Malaria Initiative Amendment

Purpose: to direct funding towards programs in the Child Survival and Health account we know are saving lives among the most vulnerable populations and away from lower priority programs, like the Global Environment Facility, which produce few results and are managed by the United Nations Development Program, which utilizes corrupt procurement practices, operates contrary to UN rules, and retaliates against whistleblowers.

What the amendment does:

This amendment would transfer \$106.7 million from the Global Environment Facility and put \$30 million into the President's Malaria Initiative and the remaining \$76.7 million into other life-saving programs in the Child Survival and Maternal Health programs.

What is the Global Environment Facility?

The Global Environment Facility is an account housed at the World Bank, which is primarily administered by the United Nations Development Program (UNDP), from which grants and contracts are awarded for the purpose of addressing and preventing alleged harms caused by manmade climate change.

OMB says the Global Environment Facility is not performing:

The Office of Management and Budget (OMB) has assessed the Global Environment Facility and found that the program cannot demonstrate results. In other words, the Facility is failing to mitigate or prevent environmental damage caused by manmade climate change.

According to OMB¹:

¹ <http://www.whitehouse.gov/omb/expectmore/summary/10002442.2004.html>

- The Global Environment Facility has not implemented performance reforms it agreed to in 2002.
- The Global Environment Facility does not allocate its funding based on performance and environmental benefit. In other words- there is no relationship between getting funded by the Facility and achieving results.
- The Global Environment Facility lacks strong anti-corruption mechanisms that include independent audits, financial disclosure and codes of ethics, and procurement based on best practices.

Global Environment Facility and the UN Development Program:

The Global Environment Facility is managed in large part by the UN Development Program that is currently under investigation by both the Senate Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations and the U.S. Mission to the UN for illicit funding arrangements with the regime in North Korea, procurement fraud, and for refusing to report how it has used the over \$100 million it has spent in North Korea over the past decade.

Earlier this week, a new UNDP whistleblower has come forward with information and internal documents that UNDP's management of the Global Environment Facility includes procurement fraud and sole source contracting with organizations that are not qualified to effectively implement the Facility's programs.

This new revelation helps explain why OMB determined that the Facility lacks anti-corruption mechanisms and is not able to demonstrate results.

Why this amendment matters:

For every dollar lost to programs like the Global Environment Facility that cannot demonstrate results and are susceptible to corruption, there is one less dollar to go towards life-saving programs with fully transparent and accountable results—like the President's Malaria

Initiative and other life-saving Child Survival and Maternal Health programs.

If we truly care about the environment, then we must realize that economically developed nations have the disposable income to invest in cleaning up the environment, the use of cleaner technologies and research into alternative energy sources. If we want to foster economic and other development, children need to survive childhood, and grow up to become healthy, productive citizens.

That's why this amendment transfers money from a failing program to life-saving children's health programs.

The President requested \$387.5 million for the President's Malaria Initiative program, but the Committee has provided only \$352.5 million, leaving the program \$30M short.

The President's Malaria Initiative has been through elaborate planning by the PMI staff, and every penny of the President's request is vital in order to reach the President's ambitious but achievable targets of cutting malaria rates in half in every focus country.

The Administration, as well as many global health advocacy groups, have asked for this successful and fully-transparent and accountable program to be fully funded at the President's request.

As a result, this amendment designates \$30M to be spent on the President's malaria initiative, and the remaining \$76.7M to go to other life-saving child survival and maternal health programs.

The President's Malaria Initiative Has Proven Track Record:

This is what a program that works looks like. It has measurable targets. It reports to you its quantified progress on those targets. That's a stark difference from the UNDP-run Global Environment Facility.

- The program has now served in some way over 10 million people living in highly endemic African countries.

- At the end of this fiscal year, that number will have ballooned to over 30 million beneficiaries.
- This figure includes spraying to protect over 2.7 million people.
- Increasing bednet ownership by 2 million people.
- 1.5 kids under 5 years old received life-saving doses of Artemisinin-based Combination Therapy (ACT).
- Over 4,000 people have been trained to conduct indoor spraying programs.
- Over 6,000 community-based health personnel have been trained in case management of malaria in pregnancy.
- Only 2 years into the program, over half the PMI countries will have 70% coverage of ACTs in clinics where people seek malaria treatment.
- Only 2 years into the program, over half the PMI countries will have 70% bed-net coverage among vulnerable populations
- At this rate, the program is well on track to achieve the President's objectives of cutting the malaria mortality in focus countries by half by covering 85% of all vulnerable populations in those countries with all 4 life-saving interventions: the right drugs, indoor spraying, bed-nets, and treatment of pregnant women.

PMI could not have done what it has without the strong support of the Congress.

Nobody knows the importance of our bilateral malaria programs better than the esteemed Chairman, the Senator from Vermont, who

took the program from spending \$1 million in Africa to almost \$90 million in just a few years. We all owe a great deal to his leadership.

Now, with the President's initiative requesting triple the funding the program used to receive, the Congress has generally been just as supportive.

However, this year, there's a problem.

This year, the program has been squeezed by \$30 million.

Now, the President has made public and strong commitments to the focus countries and his President's Malaria Initiative, so if the malaria account is squeezed by \$30M, he will continue funding those countries in the initiative.

But here's what's going to suffer:

- USAID has been planning to add 3 countries to the PMI "family" out of the base (non-PMI) malaria budget, and to treat them almost like focus countries. These are highly endemic countries of the Democratic Republic of the Congo, the Sudan and Nigeria. The President's budget includes efforts to dramatically scale up life-saving malaria interventions in these countries where babies die from malaria every day.
- If the budget is \$30M short, those countries, and the children living – and dying – in them simply won't be served. Not only will the planned scale-up in those countries not happen, those country's programs will actually be cut.
- Also likely to be cut from the malaria base (non-PMI) program if this \$30M shortfall is enacted are two multi-country regional efforts to fight malaria. First is the Amazon regional program – affecting 8 South American countries infested with malarial mosquitoes along the Amazon river. Second is the Mekong regional program, affecting 5 Asian countries with serious malaria problems in the Mekong region.

- Ultimately, our end-game with malaria is finding a vaccine. The budget for vaccine research would also be cut if Congress underfunds the program by \$30 million.

OMB Program Assessment

Program: Global Environment Facility

The Global Environment Facility is an international financial institution that helps developing countries fund projects and programs that benefit the global environment. Funding (mainly grants) is intended to cover only the incremental cost of a project that is related to its global environmental benefit.

Rating: NOT PERFORMING Results Not Demonstrated

A rating of Results Not Demonstrated (RND) indicates that a program has not been able to develop acceptable performance goals or collect data to determine whether it is performing.

- **The Global Environment Facility has been very slow to implement the reforms agreed to in 2002 as part of the last donor negotiation, the GEF-3 replenishment.** Several of those reforms are incomplete, such as some performance-related reforms. Several of these issues remain part of the current negotiations begun in 2005 to replenish the Facility's funding.
- **The Facility has not yet fully instituted key performance improvements.** For example, the Facility has not fully instituted improvements in the measurement of environmental results and implementation of a system to prioritize the allocation of its funding based on country performance and environmental benefit.
- **The Facility lacks strong anti-corruption mechanisms.** These include, for example, setting high standards, independent audit functions, financial disclosure and codes of ethics, obtaining clean annual external financial audits, and implementing procurement based on best practices.

Improvement Plan

We are taking the following actions to improve the performance of the program:

- Working with the Facility and donors to fully implement a performance-based funding allocation system based on relative country performance and environmental benefit.
- Working with the Facility and donors to establish ambitious long-term performance goals and measures and undertaking more rigorous evaluations of project performance.
- Working with the Facility and donors to strengthen anti-corruption mechanisms, including establishing high fiduciary standards and achieving clean annual audits from independent external auditors.

<http://www.whitehouse.gov/omb/expectmore/summary/10002442.2004.html>

To: Mr. Robert Benson

Chief, Ethics Office
United Nations

From: Mr. Mathieu Credo Koumoin, Ph.D.

Formerly of UNDP/GEF Climate Change Team and in charge of the West African Project on Climate Change (coordinating with 40 West African countries)
INDEX: (888036)

RE: Request for Ethics Review of my dismissal through whistle blowing retaliation review and protection from retaliation

Date: September 4th, 2007

I am a former UNDP staff member (dismissed as of December 31st 2006) with a case pending before the Joint Appeals Board (JAB acceptance letter dated February 15th, 2007). Prior to my joining UNDP/GEF on a leave of absence from the African Development Bank where I served for 3 years as a Senior Public Utilities Economist, I was an Energy Economist with the World Bank in Washington, D.C for 6 years. As of December 31st, 2007 when I was dismissed and including my academic/teaching and Research experience as a Mellon Research Fellow from the University of Pennsylvania, (Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, USA) I had 16 years of International Development experience from the World Bank, the AfDB and UNDP-GEF combined.

Following my initial success within UNDP-GEF and to avoid a perception of conflict of interest, I was encouraged by UNDP to resign my position with the AfDB in December 2005 only to be announced on March 23rd, 2006 that my contract would not be renewed when it expires in June 30th, 2006 on performance grounds. This, despite the fact that: **(i)** the performance review which had barely started was not complete; **(ii)** I received very satisfactory reviews on my performance at mid-term based on both the volume and the substantive quality of my projects (see attachment); **(iii)** was warmly congratulated by my line supervisor and even promised a promotion to D1 if the Program Executive Coordination would sign off (see attachment); **(iv)** received strong endorsement from GEFSEC Secretariat on all of my Project submissions to GEF Council which captured 85% of the entire Climate Change market niche in Sub-Saharan Africa; ahead of all other competing GEF Implementing Agencies; and **(v)** received a formal written promise of being kept on board by the Executive Coordinator around mid-term review prior to the strong procurement battles and pressures (see attachment).

The totality of the above set of circumstances led me to resign my position with the AfDB in December 2005 to ensure that my effectiveness within UNDP-GEF would not be undercut by the sizable co-financing expected from the AfDB; particularly as my line supervisor -- subsequently -- formally apologized to me for pressing me beyond the breaking point on the contract procurement and funds re-direction issues in November 2005.

I have attached to this request for review prima-facie evidence supporting that I was under tremendous pressure from my line Management to re-direct funds and carry out sole-source contracting to UNIDO (based in Vienna), and IEPF (Francophone Institute of Energy and Environment based in Quebec-Canada), and tried to bring these problems to the attention of higher officials (see attachment). It is important to note that, in my best professional judgment, the activities requested by my line Management violated basic rules of UN/UNDP procurement with respect to transparency, competition and accountability, as the African countries for which the funds were intended in the first place were being left in the dark. and the project documents approved by GEF Council were quite clear along with the initial project concept review sheet from GEFSEC which ruled that IEPF was not eligible to execute or implement the GEF African Microhydro Project on behalf of beneficiary African countries. As vividly illustrated in the enclosed annexes, my resistance to the above pressure is thoroughly documented along with my Supervisor's insistence and ultimate apologies (see attachment) only when he decided to fire me in retaliation for my stubborn rejection of a sole sourcing scheme to award IEPF together with UNIDO UNDP contracts from my Regional African Microhydro project. The sole sourcing scheme being forced upon me by my supervisors at the expense of Africa-based regional economic commissions as clearly stipulated in the GEF Council approved project documents was the only bone of contention with my Management. For my whistle blowing efforts and because I had the courage to bring these issues to the attention of the Administrator and other higher up officials, I was fired without due process and have been unable to find work; in part as a direct result of damaging references from UNDP and in part as a result of the on-going legal process.

On the basis of the above along with the pieces of evidence attached, in absence of an Ethics Office within the UNDP, and of a functional whistleblower policy as well as independent internal control and oversight mechanisms, I believe that I deserve to have my case reviewed by the United Nations Ethics Office, which is the only one mechanisms established and recognized by UN Member States, equipped to provide internal administrative review and protection from retaliation. and I am so requesting.

I look forward to your kind attention and consideration. Should you require further information you can contact me directly or my legal counsel.

Jeanne-Marie Col, Ph.D.
Associate Professor of Public Administration
and Protection Management
John Jay College of Criminal Justice
City University of New York
jcol@jjay.cuny.edu
jmcol446@aol.com
212-599-2445
(mobile 917-568-1927 and office 212 237 8077 and home 212 599 2445)

Yours sincerely,

From: frank.pinto@undp.org [<mailto:frank.pinto@undp.org>]

Sent: 13 February 2007 11:19 PM

To: edith.gasana@undp.org; georg.charpentier@undp.org; antonius.broek@undp.org; sophie.de.caen@undp.org; patricia.de.mowbray@cv.jo.un.org; toby.lanzer@undp.org; kingsley.amaning@undp.org; aurelien.agbenonci@undp.org; roberto.valent@undp.org; kiari.liman-tinguiri@undp.org; bintou.djibo@undp.org; fadzai.gwaradzimba@undp.org; daouda.toure@undp.org; mbaranga.gasarabwe@undp.org; michel.balima@undp.org; elizabeth.oduor-noah@undp.org; joseph.byll-cataria@undp.org; michele.falavigna@undp.org; alberic.kacou@undp.org; christian.lehembre@undp.org; ingrid.cyimana@undp.org; samuel.harbor@undp.org; rosine.s.coulibaly@undp.org; lalao.raharisoa@undp.org; mary.symmonds@undp.org; leoncie.bucyana@undp.org; narjess.saidane@undp.org; philippe.poinsot@undp.org; kjetil.hansen@undp.org; ibrahima.djibo@undp.org; christophe.bahuet@undp.org; vitalie.muntean@undp.org; gpoumangue@undp.org; anthony.ohemeng-boamah@undp.org; violet.kakyomya@undp.org; adama.toe@undp.org; amadou.maiga@undp.org; titus.osundina@cv.jo.un.org; adam.coulibaly@undp.org; mariam.pangah@undp.org

Cc: gilbert.houngbo@undp.org; metzi.makhetha@undp.org; pascal.karorero@undp.org; mamonyane.lekoetje@undp.org

Subject: Introducing Mr. Benoit Lebot, UNDP-GEF Regional Technical Adviser in Climate change for West and Central Africa region

Dear Colleagues,

It is my pleasure to introduce to you Mr. Benoit Lebot (France) as the new UNDP-GEF Regional Technical Adviser for Climate Change for West and Central Africa. Benoit has been a member of our UNDP-GEF team for a number of years and many of you may have already worked with him during this period. Until now, Benoit has been serving as a Regional Technical Adviser for ClimateChange in the Maghreb countries as well as a global technical adviser on energy efficiency and in particular on standards and labels. Before joining UNDP, he worked for the French Government agency ADEME and for the International Energy Agency. He is a well-respected expert in the field of energy efficient standards and labels for appliances.

Benoit will assume his new responsibilities as RTA for Climate Change in West and Central Africa with immediate effect and will be part of our Regional Coordination Unit in Dakar. Given that he will be handling three different functions (RTA in climate change for the Maghreb, and for West/Central Africa and global adviser on energy efficiency), it has been decided for cost reasons that he will initially continue to be based in Paris associated with the UNEP/Paris Technology, Industry and Energy Division as part of the UNDP-UNEP Partnership.

Benoit will be in contact with your Offices shortly to take stock of the climate change portfolios in your respective countries and to start a productive collaboration. Please join me in welcoming Benoit to this new and challenging assignment.

With warm regards,
Frank

Frank Pinto
GEF Executive Coordinator, UNDP

From: Mathieu Koumoin [mailto:mathieu.koumoin@undp.org]
Sent: Wednesday, December 21, 2005 7:23 PM
To: 'Benoit Lebot'
Cc: 'marcel.alers@undp.org'; 'ndeye.djigal.sall'
Subject: RE: to keep you in the loop: PDFa_S&L UEOMA

Dear Benoit: Thanks for the opportunity to discuss the way forward tomorrow afternoon as you suggested. Your assessment with Econoler is quite wrong because I have no quarrel with Econoler and was frankly looking forward to working with them. As a Task Manager I take responsibility for the overall oversight and quality control of projects coming out of this RCU in the CC focal area. When Consultants make a sensible suggestion to me, I take it. In this instance, however, it was my professional judgment that I needed to spread delivery risk and throwing all of my eggs in the same basket was not appealing to me at all. I have been around doing this for the past 17 years or so. I have learned to edge against the risks with Consultants and again, I should like to assure you that I would be delighted to work with Econoler on other projects if and when they are prepared to accept my TORs. Clearly, Econoler was not prepared to accept the TOR I offered and I did not shallow their justification and I take it that we are moving forward with equally qualified firms/Consultants tomorrow afternoon when we chat on the phone. Hope this clarifies the waters a bit. Thanks, Mathieu

From: Benoit Lebot [mailto:benoit.lebot@undp.org]
Sent: Wednesday, December 21, 2005 7:00 PM
To: 'Mathieu Koumoin'
Cc: marcel.alers@undp.org; 'ndeye.djigal.sall'
Subject: RE: to keep you in the loop: PDFa_S&L UEOMA

Mathieu,
Je suis en rendez-vous demain matin à l'UNEP. Donc pour se parler au téléphone mieux vaut prévoir demain après-midi.
Je regrette vivement cependant de ne pas pouvoir traiter avec Econoler International pour ce projet : peut-être as-tu des griefs vis-à-vis d'eux ? Si c'est le cas, je suis preneur d'un éclaircissement de ta part.

Cordialement,

Benoit Lebot - benoit.lebot@undp.org
Climate Change Technical Advisor - UNDP-GEF
ue Louis Vicat FR-75737 Paris Cedex 15 France
tel: +33 1 47 65 20 53 fax: +33 1 47 65 22 29

-----Original Message-----

From: Mathieu Koumoin [mailto:mathieu.koumoin@undp.org]
Sent: Wednesday, December 21, 2005 7:55 PM
To: 'Benoit Lebot'

Cc: marcel.alers@undp.org; 'ndeye.djigal.sall'
Subject: to keep you in the loop: PDFa_S&L UEOMA

Benoit: The attached is to keep you in the loop. I know that you have lots of contacts in this field, and would be grateful to have alternative names of individual Consultants and/or firms for this specific sector. I will buzz you tomorrow as I prepare to move forward.
Cheers, Mathieu

From: Pierre Langlois [mailto:planglois@econolerint.com]
Sent: Wednesday, December 21, 2005 6:49 PM
To: Mathieu Koumoin
Cc: nguessan
Subject: RE: PDFa_S&L UEOMA

Salut Mathieu,
Bien vu ta réponse sur le tout.
Il est évident que nous sommes bien déçu, compte tenu que nous t'avons amené nous même ce dossier, que nous l'avons monté sans frais pour le PNUD et que nous avons introduit nous même l'IEPF sur le tout. De plus, nous croyons que nous avons actuellement une des plus grande expertises dans le montage de standards , tout du moins dans les experts de langues françaises
Nous saurons donc mieux utiliser nos efforts de développement dans le futur...
Pierre

De : Mathieu Koumoin [mailto:mathieu.koumoin@undp.org]
Envoyé : 21 décembre, 2005 12:50
À : 'Benoit Lebot'; 'ndeye.djigal.sall'
Cc : nguessan; Pierre Langlois; marcel.alers@undp.org; yannick.glemarec@undp.org
Objet : RE: PDFa_S&L UEOMA

Benoit: Many thanks for your views on this. We have determined that we will use other qualified Consultants to go ahead on this given Econoler's position.
Thanks and best regards,
Mathieu

From: Benoit Lebot [mailto:benoit.lebot@undp.org]
Sent: Monday, November 14, 2005 10:22 AM
To: 'Mathieu Koumoin'
Subject: RE: URGENT: Update on UEMOA S & L

Bonjour Mathieu,

Je suis à mon bureau toute la semaine. Quand puis-je t'appeler ?
J'aimerais éclaircir le type de projet Full size ou medium size et l'idée d'un atelier à Ouagadougou.

A bientôt,

Benoit Lebot - benoit.lebot@undp.org
Climate Change Technical Advisor - UNDP-GEF

ADEME Office 302
27 Rue Louis Vicat FR-75737 Paris Cedex 15 France
tel: +33 1 47 65 20 53 fax: +33 1 47 65 22 29

-----Original Message-----

From: Mathieu Koumoin [mailto:mathieu.koumoin@undp.org]
Sent: Saturday, November 12, 2005 12:14 AM
To: 'Sibi Bonfils'; 'Benoit Lebot'; 'Pierre Langlois'
Cc: 'nguessan'; 'ndeye.djigal.sall'; 'ndeye.djigal.sall'
Subject: RE: URGENT: Update on UEMOA S & L

Merci Sibi: Nous procéderons comme je l'ai déjà indiqué avec un PDF-A vers un PDF-B pour un **full size project**. La contribution de l'IEPF à la préparation du Projet pour US\$11,000 devrait nous permettre de co-financer l'atelier envisagé à Ouagadougou en Décembre 2005 comme tu l'as souhaité.

Meilleures salutations,
Mathieu

From: Sibi Bonfils [mailto:sibi.bonfils@iepf.org]
Sent: Friday, November 11, 2005 9:30 PM
To: Benoit Lebot; Pierre Langlois; Mathieu Koumoin
Cc: nguessan; ndeye.djigal.sall
Subject: RE: URGENT: Update on UEMOA S & L

Si les choses se présentent ainsi, il vaut mieux aller chercher ce qu'on est sûr d'obtenir. Et je suis d'avis qu'il faille le faire très très vite en ce qui concerne l'IEPF en tout cas, pour l'engagement de notre part de contribution.

Ce serait bien dans ce cas que Mathieu informe officiellement l'IEPF de la réponse positive du GEF et des dates de début du projet ainsi que du calendrier d'exécution.

Merci Mathieu de faire le nécessaire en toute diligence. Nous sommes sur le point de fermer nos comptes.

Avec mes salutations les meilleures.

Sibi

De : Benoit Lebot [mailto:benoit.lebot@undp.org]
Envoyé : 10 novembre, 2005 14:30
À : 'Pierre Langlois'; 'Mathieu Koumoin'
Cc : 'nguissan'; 'ndeye.djigal.sall'; Sibi Bonfils
Objet : RE: URGENT: Update on UEMOA S & L

Dear All,

Sorry for being quiet today and for this late reply. Thank you Mathieu for your phone call.

I am afraid that Pierre's rationale is right and I propose that we stick to a PDF A followed by a MSP. We will try to be smart in order to make use of all existing material when providing technical and policy assistance to UEMOA countries on S&L.

I am out of the office tomorrow (November 11 is Armistice day in Europe). If necessary I can be reached on my wife's cell phone:+33 6 84 66 03 09

Best regards,

Benoit Lebot - benoit.lebot@undp.org
Climate Change Technical Advisor - UNDP-GEF

ADEME Office 302
27 Rue Louis Vicat FR-75737 Paris Cedex 15 France
tel: +33 1 47 65 20 53 fax: +33 1 47 65 22 29

From: Pierre Langlois [mailto:planglois@econolerint.com]
Sent: Thursday, November 10, 2005 5:32 AM
To: Mathieu Koumoin
Cc: nguissan; Benoit Lebot; ndeye.djigal.sall; Bonfils Sibi
Subject: RE: URGENT: Update on UEMOA S & L

Hi Mathieu,

I must say that I was very surprised by your e-mail and the new strategy proposed. First a MSP has always had a maximum of 1M\$ since the start of the GEF, so it is not a new thing. Furthermore, I guess that you are lacking some information on the new development of the GEF over the last 3 months. So let me try to explain to you the current situation:

1. In GEF 4, there is a new allocation plan that has been approved that basically exclude all countries from the UEMOA region among other countries of any serious financing. All these countries will only get a 1M\$ allocation for the next 3 years for climate change.

- Most of the funds will go to countries as China, India and Brazil, as the criteria to allocate the funds will be mainly the size of the population and the current level of carbon emissions. In this context, there is almost no possibility to get a full size project for the UEMOA countries, even under a regional project. This will also mean that the GEF will likely almost quit Africa for the next 3 years, except from some specific countries such as Egypt, Nigeria and South Africa. I do not have the exact level of funding of all countries, but this is what everybody is presenting at the GEF at this time. GEF 4 allocation methodology will also be a lot more complex than the GEF 3 one, so everybody is very nervous about this will develop in the next few weeks.
2. In GEF 3, there is about 200M\$ left to allocate before March 2006. Unfortunately, every GEF coordinator at the WB and UN got wind of this and over the last 2 months, over 600M\$ requests have been forwarded to the GEF sec. Now the strategy that the GEF, the WB and the UN are trying to develop is the following:
 - a. Try to move all the request for countries that will get important funding in GEF 4 to the GEF 4 budget and not allocate anything in GEF 3
 - b. Try to favour the small countries that will not have access to GEF 4 funds, like the UEMOA ones, mainly through small MDP so more countries will be able to benefit from it. The reason for the MSP strategy is, as you know, that these projects do not have to get the Council approval, so they can get approved right away. If you wait to go to the council, it is likely that a lot of the projects will get killed because there will only be funds for about 1/3 of the projects presented.
 - c. So these MSP have to be presented before the council of March 2006 if they have any chance to be approved. As time is critical here, only the projects that are currently presented or can be presented in the next few months will have some reasonable chances to get accepted

Based on this, this is really only two reasonable possibilities for the UEMOA project:

- Either you try to find a good consultant that will be able with the limited 50 000\$ allocated by Marcel to develop rapidly the request for the MDP
- Either you drop the project, as Marcel will certainly not approved any request for a PDF A or B that would lead to a project that has absolutely no chance to get accepted

I do not think that your proposed strategy of requesting a PDF B for a full project has any chance to be accepted, neither at the PDF level or at the full scale level at this time in this context.

I get my sources on this from very reliable sources: Len Good, President of the GEF (who I briefly talked on the phone last week. I know him as he used to be the Canadian representative at the world Bank), Chandra Govindarajalu (GEF coordinator at the World Bank) and Marcel Alers (who you know), all of which I met or talked to last week in DC or in NY.

Furthermore, I have to let you know that Yannick Glemarec refused the current UEMOA project, as we were aiming to propose a request for a full size project at the beginning when Benoit and us presented him the project with IEPF. Benoit made a great case to try to convince him the a MSP would make sense if we were to move forward, and succeeded. On my side, I had to call Marcel three times over the last three weeks to convince him that , as the project would be realised with IEPF and that Econoler would likely be involved in the development of the project, we might have reasonable chances to develop a good proposal rapidly (Marcel knows us from a long time and seen our capacity to prepare such request for the GEF in some occasions in the Arabic states). Based on this , he agreed to provide you with the PDF A fund. I am sure that without Benoit and our intervention, you would not had this OK to go forward with the project.

As far as the possibility to do something good with only 1M\$ for the project, here is our evaluation:

- First you are right that 50 000\$ to develop the project brief is a very little amount. For example, we just been awarded by the UN GEF 300 000\$ to develop a Full size project for standards in Bulgaria, Croatia, Romania and Turkey. But because we do think that this is the right thing to do at this time, and that we feel that we can develop a strategy to make it without losing our shirt, we still think that this is feasible
- We do have to recognise that it will be a lot more simple to develop something for the UEMOA countries as:
 - There are small markets for the type of equipment we will be focusing on
 - There is no foundation on standards in these countries, so no difficulties to find the current status of each country like the European project
 - The fact that they have already a joint organisation (UEMOA) that can take care of this makes it a lot more simple
 - The fact that the proposed standard can be developed as a common one, and not as one per country, as it will be the case in our European project
- What we would propose is not to visit all 8 countries in the MSP, but just to focus on one or two as representative of the 8, and develop only one common project for all the countries. As the budget is so limited, we would focus mainly on office work with limited visit in January at UEMOA and maybe one other country if we can afford it.
- As time will be very important if we are going to have any chance to make the project approved, we think that we should focus our discussions with people at UEMOA and disseminate the information through e-mails and mail, and not through meetings in the countries

Based on all this, and if this can make sense to you, Econoler International says available to take such a mandate. As the full 50 000\$ will be requested to develop the MSP request, you may have to go through a bidding process. We have no problem with this, as we know we will have reasonable chances to win such a bid. For example, we were the sole bidder who passed the technical qualification for the European project. As you can see, there is not too much expertise in this field at this time, and specially someone who can work in French. You can also plead the urgency, and select one consultant based on qualification, if such a thing can be done in the UN system.

In all cases, I think that your options are very limited. As you may want to validate all these information at some point (you do not have to take my word for it), please ask directly Marcel about this or Yannick, who I am sure will confirm you the same thing.

I hope that this information will be of some use, and that you will understand how difficult it was for Benoit and Econoler to get you to this PDF A. Now, it is a matter of your decision to decide if the proposed plan makes sense, or decide to try your own way.

Benoit may have another alternative that would be based on its more global approach on standard that he is developing. It is certainly a way out of the current mess of GEF 4, but it is still at the concept stage and is more a long shot at this time. He may tell you more about it, but I am pretty sure we will tell you to take the MSP at this time and make the most of it.

I hope that you will make the right decision and that we will be able to provide you some support to go further on this interesting project for the benefit of the UEMOA countries.

Sincerely

Pierre

De : Mathieu Koumoin [mailto:mathieu.koumoin@undp.org]
Envoyé : 9 novembre, 2005 14:56
À : Pierre Langlois
Cc : nguessan; 'Benoit Lebot'; 'ndeye.djigal.sall'
Objet : URGENT: Update on UEMOA S & L

Pierre and Benoit: We are finalizing the submission for the above and just spent a few minutes with Nguessan on the phone. It now appears that a regional MSP cannot award more than US\$1 MILLION in GEF grant for the 8 participating UEMOA Countries. I discussed this matter internally and agreed with Nguessan that this might spread us too thin on the 8 African countries putting the project's success at risk. The option of backing off completely is not sensible as this is a good project idea and the endorsement letters are all in. In view of this, I intend to propose to UNDP-GEF HQ to clear a PDF-A towards a PDF-B for pipeline entry next February so we can still claim the intended US\$3.5 million in GEF resources **as a full size project** for the 8 countries combined.

I am supposed to discuss this tomorrow with HQ after 2:00pm NY time and would appreciate your take as soon as possible. Under the usual circumstances, I will expect my consultants to execute their TORs on this in December and early January 2006 so I can have the PDF-B output ready for the GEFSEC pipeline submission in February 2006. I will still target US\$3.5 million in GEF grants for the 8 participating countries.

Please, let me have your quick feed-back. Thanks, Mathieu

Whistle Blower Notification prior to Mr. KOUMOIN's Meeting With Ombudsman in New York.

From: Mathieu Koumoin [mailto:mathieu.koumoin@undp.org]
Sent: Friday, February 24, 2006 3:09 AM
To: 'Yannick Glemarec'
Cc: 'frank.pinto@undp.org'; 'jeffrey.avina@undp.org';
'richard.barathe@undp.org'; 'marcel.alers@undp.org'; 'ndeye.djigal.sall';
'Joseph Byll-Cataria'; 'Philippe Poinso'; 'tegegnetwork.gettu@undp.org';
'mary.symmonds@undp.org'; 'emmanuel.oladipo@undp.org'; 'Adame Coulibaly';
'olav.kjorven@undp.org'; 'brian.gleeson@undp.org'; 'gilbert.houngbo@undp.org'
Subject: URGENT AND CONFIDENTIAL: GEF African Microhydro Initiative in Sub-Saharan Africa

Dear Yannick:

Many thanks for your attached e-mail in connection with the expected arrangements for the approved GEF African Microhydro Initiative (US\$19 million in approved GEF Grants, approximately US\$5 million in UNDP-Corporate support together with and estimated US\$96 million in AfDB investment co-financing bringing total project cost to **over US\$145 million** on top of government subsidies for the 10 countries participating in the first round of this Initiative). Although your e-mail provides some perspective on the merits of careful budget management for the preparation of a project that you have described to be unprecedented in the history of UNDP-GEF and – perhaps -- the entire history of GEF (World Bank, UNEP, UNDP combined) in Africa for the specific Climate Change focal area (I might add), I am forced to reply because of the serious allegations of resource mismanagement and misleading inferences contained in Marcel Alers initial e-mail.

1. I intend to provide a few facts and request that **UNDP-GEF Executive Coordination sees to it that Marcel Alers withdraws his unsubstantiated allegations**. In setting to do so, I should also like to seek guidance from you, UNDP-GEF Executive Coordination, BDP-EEG (Olav) together with RBA and HR on how best to address this matter in part because Marcel Alers is my line supervisor, and in part because Marcel Alers who is the de facto head of the Climate Change Cluster at HQ already apologized in writing after a similar incident that led him to issue a formal written document on file within the internal UNDP-GEF database. In the above, he vowed not to repeat his unsubstantiated and bogus attacks on the Regional Coordinator who designed and who is in charge of the approved GEF African Microhydro Initiative. And yet, my worse fears have come true on the face of his performance gap allegations against the key players of the GEF African Microhydro Initiative in the attached e-mail trail. As I indicated to Marcel, there can be no quarrel with the results, no quarrel with the facts and no quarrel with the evidence that Sub-Saharan Africa and UNDP-Field Offices are serious about mobilizing GEF resources to address poverty and help meet the challenges of the MDGs. Using Climate Change as an operational outfit to get there should not deserve punishment with the kind of allegations he has put forward.

2. The timing is particularly critical to us as we prepare to formally seek your approval for the second round of African Microhydro Projects targeting another US\$20-US\$25 million in Grants and some US\$110 million in AfDB Co-financing support under the Leadership of UNDP-Abuja. Earlier today, I informed our Office in Nigeria that we have received US\$750, 000 in written co-financing from TRAC resources from 7 out of the 10 countries whose governments have formally endorsed the second project and its focus on the MDGs through the usual GEF Operational Focal Points. I did not mention any specific GEF resource mobilization targets for the new 10 participating African Countries (Nigeria, Burkina, Gambia, Ghana, Sao-Tomé, Bissau, Guinea Conakry, Sierra-Leone, Cote-d'Ivoire and Equatorial Guinea) despite my professional disagreement with Marcel and honest assessment that a target of some US\$20-US\$25 million is still in reach under the new GEF resource allocation framework. This is particularly true given Nigeria's tentative allocation under RAF and the commitments of the other countries/governments to work with us and the AfDB again.

3. I should like to document that contrary to Marcel's allegations, the team of some 20 International Consultants who worked on the preparation of the approved first round of Microhydro projects did a remarkable job and delivered despite an ordinary difficult operational environment and that I am having some difficulty rationalizing Marcel's claims that after close to 14 months of field work (over US\$0.5 million in air ticket costs per UNDP-Bamako financial archives) and constructive engagement with 10 governments together with 2 international Steering Committee meetings (Douala, Sept 2004 and Vienna in April 2005 Chaired by Frank Pinto) at a time when Marcel was not even working in the Climate Change Focal Area, it is Marcel Alers and Cynthia Page (a US-based Consultants who has probably never visited any of the participating countries) who carried out the bulk of the work which led to GEF Council approval of the Project because of the poor performance of the 20 International Consultants; all selected through International Competitive Bidding with sizable input from Steering Committee Members such as the African Development Bank in view of the investment focus and catalytic GEF technical assistance support. As you know, the credentials of the Consultants are available from UNDP-Bamako and their outputs posted on the project preparation digital workspace www.microhydro-undp.org which Marcel commended when he visited with us in Dakar last December. Moreover, Marcel and (perhaps) Yannick too are aware that a number of these key Consultants (EESD, LLC in Washington, D.C. and Econoler International based in Quebec) have been recently hired by our counterpart in UNDP-GEF/Paris to support the PRODOC development of the US\$10.5 million Wind project that we designed and brought to approval in 2003 on behalf of Tunisia before I was re-assigned to Sub-Saharan Africa. Why is Marcel approving the use of the same Consultants in Tunisia and Morocco if he really believes that their performance in Sub-Saharan Africa was exceedingly poor ?

4. It is important to note that we do have evidence on file clearly demonstrating that much of the final fine-tuning required by GEFSEC in the last days prior to Project submission consisted in re-inserting the valuable work by our Consultants which was surprisingly removed by Marcel and – perhaps – Cynthia as illustrated below:

GEFSEC comment: (page 5 of 25 from Review Sheet):

The project deals with renewable energy, but its barrier removal rationale is limited, so it's eligibility under OP6 is questionable. In order to be eligible, it needs to adopt a long-term capacity-building perspective, rather than a focus on immediate investment. Furthermore, the significant motivation with productive uses that was given at pipeline entry now seems to play a role only as an afterthought. This aspect should be reintegrated.

Per the attached rebuttal sheet (see page 6, paragraph 5), we simply documented that: *“The September 2, 2005 initial UNDP-GEF transmission of the Project’s Executive Summary included specific developments of the barrier removal rationale for the project. This will be included in the revised version by September 29th, 2005. GEF’s intervention in the regional micro-hydropower project is intended to remove the constraints and barriers that contributed to the managerial and institutional disarray of the RE sector, principally micro-hydro systems which have yet to gain full recognition in the energy balance of the participating countries. GEF will support the following incremental activities.”* The evidence is compelling and suggests that we simply did not want to raise troubling questions on how and why Marcel and Cynthia did remove the key elements of response contained in the original project documents (prior to Marcel’s visit to Dakar and Cynthia’s remote editorial inputs) in their purported attempts to help. Is this the rescue effort Marcel is alluding to now? Nevertheless, I would have no problem granting Marcel and Cynthia the credit of having made a contribution to an already outstanding piece of work produced by the Consultants that we recruited and managed successfully (per Frank Pinto’s own acknowledgement and appreciations following Vienna), particularly as Marcel’s field trip in Dakar allowed us to explain to him the design of close to 14 month of hard work.

5. For the sake of clarity, I am simply providing the following attachments: (i) Consultant recruitment report approved by the purchase committee of UNDP-Bamako in the Summer of 1994; (ii) the Vienna Steering Committee Recommendations(MOU) approved by Frank together with UNDP-GEF Executive Coordination’s candid appreciation for the quality of the work carried by the Project team (meaning the Regional Coordinator and the bulk of the Consultants who participated in the Vienna deliberations on the watch of Frank Pinto, Executive UNDP-GEF Coordinator); (iii) the supplemental PDF-B requests documenting all preparatory expenses approved by Marcel and UNDP-GEF Executive Coordination which answers all questions raised by Marcel and shed some lights on the high preparation costs pointed out by Yannick.

6. With respect to the need for further limited Consultant resources in the amount of US\$37,000 in fees to cover PRODOC finalization work in the participating countries, the TORs and detailed mission plans will be provided to Yannick separately as it appears that agreement in principle has been granted to move forward once the TORs are shared and agreed to.

7. Based on the above, it is sensible to suggest that the technical justification for the project preparation costs pointed out by Yannick and Marcel are clear and were agreed with both Marcel, UNDP-GEF Executive Coordination and GEFSEC which approved the supplemental PDF funding on the basis of compelling force majeure situations in the participating countries rather than 2 separate PDFs contrary to Marcel's misleading interpretations. In a nutshell, the case against the quality of deliverables of the Consultants used is empty at best and unnecessarily counterproductive as we prepare to match or beat the records established by the approval of the first project under the Leadership of UNDP-Abuja.

8. As illustrated in our earlier response that prompted Marcel's previous apology, UNIDO's claim for UNDP-GEF's hard earned US\$5 million out of the US\$19 million approved by the November 2005 Council was improper and not justifiable as this Regional Coordinator saw it. Likewise, IEPF's unilateral claim of sole sourcing of technical Assistance activities in the Microhydro Project was not acceptable and the above was clearly not an issue of Consultant performance management but rather of exemplary leadership under very difficult and challenging operational conditions.

I look forward to Marcel's withdrawal of the allegations against the professionalism and hard work by UNDP-Bamako and the 10 UNDP-Field Offices in Sub-Saharan Africa who supported and appreciated the work done by a good team of Consultants.

Thanks for your leadership and preparedness to help move forward.
Mathieu

From: Yannick Glemarec [<mailto:yannick.glemarec@undp.org>]
Sent: Wednesday, February 22, 2006 11:24 PM
To: 'Mathieu Koumoin'; marcel.alers@undp.org
Cc: abdoulaye.ndiaye@undp.org; landing.sagna@undp.org;
ndeye.sigal.sall@undp.org; frank.pinto@undp.org
Subject: RE: Dakar Regional Business Plan

Dear Marcel and Mathieu,

Regarding point 8, I do not see any other solution than covering this additional expense from our admin budget, as we can ill afford to drop the ball at this stage. However, and as mentioned by Marcel, I would like to see a clear proposal for this, and in particular for the selection of the consultants and their performance management.

I am also concerned about the total amount of resources required to formulate this project, as it is unprecedented in the history of UNDP/GEF. As part of the evaluation of this formulation, we need to precisely document the expenditures incurred during the formulation and draw conclusions for better budget management in the future.

Best. Yannick.

From: Mathieu Koumoin [mailto:mathieu.koumoin@undp.org]
Sent: Monday, February 20, 2006 5:08 PM
To: marcel.alers@undp.org
Cc: abdoulaye.ndiaye@undp.org; landing.sagna@undp.org; ndeye.sigal.sall@undp.org;
yannick.glemarec@undp.org
Subject: RE: Dakar Regional Business Plan

Dear Marcel: Many thanks for your e-mail. I have been instructed to take a 2-day sick-leave to recover from a bad flu and I would like to provide a quick-feed back from home this evening to get the ball rolling for the sake of time. I will take further stock with you and Yannick possibly when I am back to the office. Please, find enclosed my quick feed-back inserted in font color in your original text.
Mathieu

-----Original Message-----

From: marcel.alers@undp.org [mailto:marcel.alers@undp.org]
Sent: Monday, February 20, 2006 5:43 AM
To: mathieu.koumoin@undp.org
Cc: abdoulaye.ndiaye@undp.org; landing.sagna@undp.org;
ndeye.sigal.sall@undp.org; yannick.glemarec@undp.org
Subject: Dakar Regional Business Plan

Dear Mathieu,

Sorry that it took so long to get back to you on this, but I have now finally had time to look at the revised input on CC to the West and Central Africa Regional Business Plan. Please consider the following comments. I have copied Yannick on this message, so that he is in the loop on this, and he may be weighing in on this should I be unreasonable. (Yannick, see point 8 of this email for an item requiring your action).

Mathieu: Better late than never.

1. Overall, I think the write-up of the section is definitely improved and incorporates elements of what we discussed while you were in Mexico.

The text in para. 28 is OK, provided that we can obtain an OK from Dick on the proposed umbrella approach with a suite of microhydro MSPs as a second phase to the Regional Micro Hydro project. I have not yet had time to discuss this with him, but definitely will do your bidding on this.

Mathieu: Thanks for reverting after your discussions with Dick.

2. I find the presentation of resource mobilization numbers in para. 29 still to be confusing and misleading and it does not give a clear picture of what was already mobilized (in 2005) and what will be done in 2006. You should only count any new projects to be approved in 2006,

which are, as far as I can tell 4 MSPs (currently in various stages of preparation) and the proposed new microhydro MSPs. On this last one, I consider that proposed number of 11 new MSPs to be unrealistic and not feasible. I would strongly suggest that you lower this and spread it out over two years at least.

Mathieu: I am not sure I understand your assessment on the 11 MSPs lumped into clusters under the umbrella of the first project. I think that you are correct if your understanding of the write up was that we would deliver this in FY06. The commitment intended in the text was rather that we would advance on the preparation. The first project took 14 months in the active preparation phase with various force majeure situations which did justify the supplemental PDF-B funding. As always, I would urge you to have a positive outlook on the work at hand and take it that if and when resources are made available for the job, we will continue to deliver. It is quite a huge challenge; however, I would not cast it as "unrealistic and not feasible."

3. In terms of your proposed travel plan and consultant/travel budget, I have some concerns. I have no major problems with your own proposed travel plan, except that it includes several missions to attend steering committee meetings that seem overbudgeted in terms of time (a 7 day mission just to attend a steering committee meeting, which most likely only takes 1 or 2 days, seems a bit much). Also, it would help if you could include PIMS numbers when referring to projects to be serviced. On one project, the Ghana transport MSP, for which you propose a trip, I wonder how viable this project still is, after having been in our pipeline for more than 3 years now to no visible success, and especially after the recent approval of a WB fullsize \$ 8million GEF transport project in the country as part of the Feb 2006 intersessional!

Mathieu: Own travel days have been reduced and thanks for helping out with my work/family life balance. Ghana PDF-A has now been dropped for the reasons that you mentioned.

Ndeye/Landing will include the PIMS numbers per my discussions with them today.

4. What I am concerned about is the requested level of input to finalize the formulation of prodocs for the Regional Micro Hydro project to obtain CEO endorsement. A quick calculation reveals that this adds up to almost \$ 80,000 including your own travel costs, plus the consultants and their travel, but excluding the cost of your time, so the real cost

is even higher. So far, the preparation of this project has benefited from 2 PDF B's (for an amount of \$ 590,000), as well as very significant levels of cash cofinancing from UNDP Country Offices, bringing the total amount of preparatory resources over \$ 1 million! Normally this level of resources should be more than adequate to prepare a full-fledged project brief, as well as the detailed project document with all required implementation arrangements.

Mathieu: Your point is well taken and you may recall the various force majeure situations and the detailed documentation that was submitted to GEFSEC all along. This was an unusual project in an overly difficult operational environment with a final output that the World Bank and UNEP never produced in this focal area in Francophone Africa; something that was never expected to happen from UNDP-GEF given its innovative and investment focus above and beyond our traditional capacity building niche ! Perhaps, these can bring some perspective on the cost. Please, review the documentation submitted to GEFSEC and let me know if you require further discussions. I was quite surprised myself to find out that each steering committee meeting did cost close to US\$100,000. The costs are well below the benchmarks for investment projects per World Bank figures; I can document this when I return to the office. 3% of total project cost would bring us around US\$4.5 million in preparation resources!!! I think that we have been dealing with a different ball game than the traditional UNDP-GEF TA/Capacity building project and we came up with a real performance even including the extra resources needed to finish the job.

5. Unfortunately though, all this money was clearly not enough to prepare an adequate project brief, as emergency assistance was necessary (by way of Cynthia's time and my own, including my mission) to pull this off. I have therefore serious questions about how this money was used, clearly there was a problem either with the consultants selected or their management, as the necessary results were not there at the end of the day.

Marcel: I would prefer not answering this at this time because of the tone and implication of your suggestion contrary to what really went on here. I am surprised that you are going this route again. Perhaps, it may be that you had too much information to absorb in such a short time; (www.microhydro-undp.org is the digital workspace with

the evidence of the work contributed). You may recall that, you admitted while you were in Dakar that this was quite impressive. At the time, your own assessment was that "others at HQ" were not aware that such a good job was done and I had honestly been counting on you to be the messenger of good news, not to try to re-write history. History was already made, I look forward to much bigger achievements for Africa and would not get involved in the credit sharing battle which I have some difficulty understanding. RCA time is another exercise for which I am very well prepared, when and if you go on the record so misleadingly. There can be no quarrel with the facts, no quarrel with the results and no quarrel with the evidence which you may not even remember. I do.

6. To continue now along the same path and by being pressured to sign off on this budget request simply would not be the responsible thing for me to do. I would take serious issue with your statement in para 50 of the Business Plan when you say "Outsourcing a number of selected tasks with seasoned and talented consultants around the pool of local/national/Regional and International expertise developed or identified during the formulation of Microhydro 1 is an intuitively appealing approach that could prove fruitful." Experience has shown otherwise so far.

Mathieu: Your assessment on the Consultants that we did use is not factually correct. But again the managerial decision made by HQ will be applied as always.

7. The problem now is of course how to move this project from Council approval to CEO endorsement, to clear the way for its implementation. As I had mentioned during our telecon, one way of doing this would to ask Country Offices to fund these costs, either from their core budgets or as an advance from their share of the project fee. I understand, and agree with you, that this may cause problems, not in the least as many have already put in quite considerable resources so far.

Mathieu: We did discuss this.

8. It may therefore be necessary to cover this additional expense from our admin budget, as you request, if only to save grace and avoid a debacle with high political costs. However, I would like to request Yannick's view on this and ultimately his OK for this, or any other suitable solution. If agreed, we would need to discuss the modalities for this and in particular the selection of the consultants and their management needs to be discussed.

Mathieu: I look forward to Yannick's decision.

With best regards,

Marcel Alers
Climate Change Manager

From: Sibi Bonfils [mailto:Sibi.Bonfils@iepf.org]
Sent: Friday, January 30, 2004 6:14 AM
To: Mathieu Koumoin
Subject: Re: Version révisée des Documents Micro-Hydro

Sibi

```
> Sibi:
> Many thank for your continued support.  PLease, find the attached.
>
> Mathieu
>
>
> -----
>                                     Name: JAN-29RegMicro-HydroConcept.pdf
> JAN-29RegMicro-HydroConcept.pdf    Type: Portable Document Format
(application/pdf)
>                                     Encoding: base64
>
>
>                                     Name: Submit_RCUREgional_MicroPDF-
BJAN29_9.doc
> Submit_RCUREgional_MicroPDF-BJAN29_9.doc    Type: Microsoft Word Document
(application/msword)
>                                     Encoding: base64
```



agence intergouvernementale
de la francophonie

Québec, le 22 juillet 2004

N/Réf. : nc/448/04

Monsieur Frank Pinto
Executive Coordinator
UNDP-GEF
Energy and Climate Change
New York
USA

Objet : Projet régional de Micro-centrales hydroélectriques

Monsieur le Coordonnateur exécutif,

Dans sa correspondance en date du 28 mai dernier, le représentant résident du PNUD-Bamako – Mali m'informe de la décision du Fonds pour l'environnement mondial (FEM) de financer le PDF-B du Projet régional visé en objet. Il demande, par la même occasion, le versement sur le compte du PNUD-Mali de la contribution de l'IEPF au co-financement de la phase préparatoire de ce projet.

Je me félicite de l'aboutissement heureux des efforts déployés de part et d'autre pour soumettre à temps le dossier de ce projet au FEM. Le PNUD et l'IEPF ont bien eu raison d'associer leurs efforts, somme toute complémentaires, dans cette démarche.

Je m'étonne cependant que l'IEPF n'ait jamais été officiellement saisi de ce résultat et surtout qu'il le soit par le représentant résident du Mali avec lequel il n'a jamais été en rapport pour cette affaire.

Comme nous l'indiquions dans notre correspondance du 23 juin 2003 à M. Mathieu Koumoin, Coordonnateur régional du PNUD pour les changements climatiques, après sa visite de travail à notre siège, les efforts variés d'intermédiation et de financement que nous déployons dans ce cadre s'inscrivent dans une perspective de collaboration ouverte avec le PNUD. C'est du reste dans cette perspective qu'a été élaboré un projet de memorandum définissant le cadre de cette collaboration et un portefeuille de projets conjoints autour desquels devait se construire notre partenariat.

Or, si le projet régional de micro-centrales hydroélectriques connaît aujourd'hui un début de mise en œuvre, nous n'avons aucune information sur les autres projets du portefeuille et sur le memorandum. De plus, nous ne savons pas dans quelles conditions doit s'engager la réalisation de ce projet.

Il est difficile, dans ce contexte où les bases de notre collaboration restent encore mal définies et où notre participation aux décisions concernant le projet de micro-centrales hydroélectriques est encore incertaine, d'envisager le versement de notre contribution.

C'est dans l'attente des dispositions que vous voudrez bien prendre pour faire aboutir les processus engagés et pour apporter les clarifications demandées ci-dessus que je vous prie d'agréer, Monsieur le Coordonnateur exécutif, l'expression de ma considération distinguée.



Sibi Bonfils
Directeur adjoint

p.j.
c.c. M. Mathieu Koumoin
Coordonnateur régional pour les changements climatiques
PNUD/FEM



INSTITUT DE L'ÉNERGIE ET DE L'ENVIRONNEMENT DE LA FRANCOPHONIE IEPF
56, RUE SAINT-PIERRE - 3^e étage - QUÉBEC G1K 4A1 CANADA TÉL. 1 418 692 5727
TÉLÉCOPIE 1 418 692 5644 COURRIEL iepf@iepf.org INTERNET <http://www.iepf.org>

L'IEPF est un organe subsidiaire de l'Agence intergouvernementale de la Francophonie
opérateur principal de l'organisation internationale de la Francophonie

Yannick:

Welcome back and many thanks for your e-mail. Sorry that I had unintentionally blocked the review at HQ. I should provide a quick (but factually correct) answer to your questions before volunteering additional background with the hope that this would be helpful.

1. For the projects under my supervision, the answer to the question as to whether IEPF's or GEF's funds will be co-mingled is yes. In almost all of my projects where a close cooperation with IEPF is envisaged, IEPF funds are expected to be wired to UNDP. In all of the above, however, no GEF funds will be expected to be wired to IEPF on a sole sourcing procurement basis. In October 2003, when I first engaged GEFSEC on the ways in which IEPF was going to collaborate with UNDP-GEF for the preparation and future execution of the Regional Micro-minihydropower project, GEFSEC raised the issue of the status of IEPF. At the time and with Dick's input, we made the case that IEPF would act as a technical assistance entity given that the Institute's legal status is not that of a donor Agency but rather a technical Assistance, International Capacity Development body focusing on Energy and the Environment. Dick and I further insisted that because of the above, it would not be sensible to prevent IEPF from bidding on UNDP executed projects as a result of the Institute's collaboration/partnership with UNDP-GEF, particularly in instances where IEPF had a clear comparative advantage.
2. My recollection is that we agreed with GEFSEC that IEPF would have no preferential treatment and would be subject to all required internal UNDP procurement procedures for consulting services whether the Institute was directly bidding for a UNDP/UNDP-GEF service contract or whether it was acting on behalf of one of its affiliates by way of a recommendation.
3. In point 1 above, IEPF funds would and/or could flow to UNDP when resources are pulled together indiscriminately and executed as such (please, refer to the detailed example of the documented Mini-Microhydro Project PDF-B under implementation). Likewise, in point 2 GEF funds would and/or could flow to IEPF or its affiliates so long as no upfront preferential treatment is granted; i.e. selection following internal UNDP procedures and sanctioned on the basis of pure merit of the Institute. Again, here, I should like to request that you review the attached detailed example of the selection of Econoler (an IEPF affiliate Canadian Firm operating in the Energy/Environment Sector) to lead the field technical feasibility studies under execution in the context of the above mentioned project.

How did we do it ?

4. A project Steering committee including the AfDB, IEPF, UNDP-GEF, UNDP-Country Offices (and the World Bank Institute as of June 2004), made recruitment selections to UNDP-Bamako, the Lead Country Office based on an open competitive tender issued on the Energy and Environment Network and various consultations with our field offices which recommended several candidates. The recommendations of the provisional Chair on behalf of the Committee was sent to UNDP-Bamako.
5. UNDP-Bamako has its own purchase committee with its own rules and working arrangements. The Office in Bamako carried out a thorough and critical review of the recommendations made by the Project Steering Committee and invited the Regional Coordinator for Climate Change to present and argue each selection in his capacity as provisional Chairman of the Project Steering Committee. It is expected that the September 2004 meeting of the above Ad hoc body will most likely select another Chairperson.

6. In reference to the attached minutes signed by the UNDP-Bamako purchase committee members and the Res. Rep/OIC, UNDP-Bamako agreed with the initial recommendations on the basis of the thoroughness and transparency that guided the initial recommendations made by the Steering Committee. UNDP-Bamako was not only satisfied with the outcome but underscored the quality of the selection, which will presumably yield a satisfactory PDF-B implementation.
7. The end of this “short” story is that an IEPF affiliate was among the firms selected and we would have assumed that a similar process could have led to GEF funds flowing to IEPF if the Institute had to be selected through such a competitive and transparent process. Please, review the initial recommendations by the project Steering committee, the selection criteria documenting the comprehensives of the work done by the Steering Committee together with the subsequent review and analysis carried out by UNDP-Bamako and the Econoler contract that resulted from the above exercise. I should appreciate it if you could help find out from a legal perspective if there is any objection to this to continue as planned for the Second round of the Microhydro Project and the many others under my supervision as planned.

Regards,
Mathieu

From: marcel.alers@undp.org [mailto:marcel.alers@undp.org]

Sent: Friday, October 28, 2005 7:28 AM

To: Mathieu Koumoin

Cc: 'Yannick Glemarec'; 'Frank Pinto'; ndeye.djigal.sall@undp.org

Subject: Re: RE:Clarifications requested: Towards GEF CEO Endorsement, UNIDO Funded and Executed Activities in Microhydro Project (US\$714, 000)

Mathieu,

I did have some time to look at this in a bit more detail. It was not my intention to put you on the defensive to this extent, but I realize that indeed it was necessary to refresh my memory on some of these issues. Thank you for taking the effort to do so, I think it was useful to recap the history on the collaboration with these two institutions.

I have read your explanations and I do recall most of this having been discussed. Now that it is clear, I don't think there are any further misunderstandings and you can proceed accordingly.

A few minor points: on IEPF and procurement roles. GEFSec does not have specific procurement rules and guidelines for its projects, as far as I know. As this is a typical implementation issue they rely on the IA's rules and procedures in this matter. Further, since IEPF will essentially play a role as service provider, I think it can be beneficial to play the competition card and let them compete with any others for getting the contracts. So please continue with the adopted approach by following UNDP rules for procurement of these type of services. One small clarification: what do you mean when you say "IEPF wants our assistance in operationalizing up to \$ 400,000 in Technical Assistance resources"?

On UNIDO, again, I now understand better what the arrangement is and on what previous agreement it is based. I therefore understand that UNIDO will co-finance around \$ 700,000 for a pre-agreed set of services and TA activities and that it will execute these, as their own resources, themselves. However, they will not execute any of the GEF resources.

In short, you can proceed as planned and sorry for causing this "scare".

For the future, you need to understand that it is not necessary, indeed not desirable, to always copy all of us on all the technical details of what is by any standards a rather complex project. In addition, your emails tend to be very long with lots of details. It is good to record these for the files and would encourage you to do so in PIMS (under diary section you can paste them in). I have simply too many other projects to deal with to be able to give all your emails full attention and this is even more the case for Frank and Yannick. Only emails that request my specific approval or non-objection should be brought to my attention.

I hope that this clarifies the matter. Please post this email in PIMS for the record.

Best,

Marcel Alers
Climate Change Manager, a.i.

=====

From: Mathieu Koumoin [mailto:mathieu.koumoin@undp.org]
Sent: Thursday, October 27, 2005 11:18 PM
To: 'marcel.alers@undp.org'
Cc: 'Yannick Glemarec'; 'Frank Pinto'; 'ndeye.djigal.sall@undp.org'
Subject: RE:Clarifications requested: Towards GEF CEO Endorsement, UNIDO Funded and Executed Activities in Microhydro Project (US\$714,000)

Thanks Marcel: The answers requested are provided hereafter under a different font color in your original message. I look forward to your instructions for further actions. Mathieu.

From: marcel.alers@undp.org [mailto:marcel.alers@undp.org]
Sent: Thursday, October 27, 2005 3:49 AM
To: Mathieu Koumoin
Cc: yannick.glemarec@undp.org
Subject: Re: RE: Towards GEF CEO Endorsement, UNIDO Funded and Executed Activities in Microhydro Project (US\$714,000)

Mathieu,

I wanted to come back to this for some time now, but I am still traveling and have been very busy otherwise. However, I feel that I can no longer wait to flag this with you at this point.

As you will recall, we had discussed the potential role of UNIDO (as well as IEPF for that matter) in considerable detail at several occasions and I had pressed you quite hard to clarify exactly the role of both in the project and to spell this out in the project document that we had to submit. I think in the end we had agreed that there would be no UNIDO cofinancing and that there would not be a UNIDO executing role in this project. I think we had a similar agreement on IEPF.

On IEPF.

Mathieu: True, you had requested that the roles of both IEPF and UNIDO be clarified in the project document before submission. As you may remember, you were here in Dakar and worked with us on the finalization of all Council documents under extreme time pressure and I presented you with the following explanation. As for IEPF, I indicated that IEPF was supposed to send us a clear proposal summarizing the areas where they expected to play a more prominent role but this never came. However, I

noted from earlier discussions during steering committee meeting that IEPF could add value on: (a) Microhydro Equipment standardization and certification activities; (b) diffusion of all feasibility studies out of the PDF-B exercise; (c) capacity building activities at the RECs (Regional Economic Commission) level; (d) rural electricity sector policy harmonization owing to the Institute's recognized standing experience in power sector reform; and (e) support to the African Microhydro Network. I did inform you that these were intuitive areas where IEPF could potentially add value pending further confirmation on their part. The question as to whether IEPF would be designated as sole provider of the intended services raised a number of procurement issues that were discussed back in November 2003 with Dick Hosier and Biagini, the GEFSEC OP/Task Manager at the time before Christine took over the GEFSEC review of the project in recent months. If need be, I will search my own files further and will e-mail you the initial agreement with GEFSEC on this key issue. In the meantime, my recollection is that GEFSEC supported an open tender process by which UNDP-GEF could not specify in the project document that IEPF was the most suitable candidate worldwide to render the proposed technical assistance services. It is also my recollection that the fact that IEPF was not a GEF Implementing/Executing Agency was considered an additional reason not to encourage an upfront designation of IEPF as the entity leading or carrying out the execution of GEF funded activities for which GEFSEC supported an open tender process. The agreement – as I think was documented in my files to be recovered – was that IEPF should abide by all internal UNDP procurement rules in bidding for the technical assistance activities supported by the GEF Trust fund although it was mutually understood that reference to IEPF's technical assistance capabilities in the documents could be accommodated, particularly if IEPF was executing its own funding. Perhaps, you may recall that, at the time the UNDP-GEF Principal Technical Advisor was Dick Hosier and I am sure that the above can be further ascertained if need be. I will try my best to recover the e-mail trail to that effect if requested to do so.

In finalizing the Council documents while you were in Dakar, I believe that I presented to you the dilemma and possible approval risks in raising undue expectations with IEPF and placing the project clearance at risks by ignoring the recommendations/agreement reached with GEFSEC before you took over the UNDP-GEF PTA assignment. I further explained to you that if these complex issues could not sensibly be resolved before GEF Council approval, the post Council approval phase could allow further discussions so the partners would – hopefully -- understand the transparency of the process and the “bonafide” professional/technical decisions being made. I also informed you that IEPF had indicated its own intention to support the additional investigation and consultations leading to a detailed articulation of the services that the Institute would target or would be prepared to help implement. Please, look at the initial review by GEFSEC of the first Microhydro proposal/PDF-B Concept that was denied pipeline entry back in October/November 2003. You would read that

GEFSEC did require that Africa-based organization take the lead along with African NGOs rather than the opposite. If the above summarizes the discussions that we had in Dakar then it is not factually correct on your part to now come back and suggest that it was agreed while you were here that IEPF would have no role to play in the Project. As part of the annexes to the MOU with IEPF, microhydro is clearly spelled out as an activity where collaboration is on-going between UNDP-GEF and IEPF so that I do not know who could realistically contemplate terminating that line of collaboration unless instructed otherwise based on the information that I have. While IEPF had clearly entertained/hoped for an Execution role in Microhydro, I have consistently expressed my professional preference to strictly follow UNDP procurement rules and GEFSEC recommendations as can be further documented upon request. Please, take it that your recollection on the IEPF case was not accurate or simply let me know the new institutional position/marching orders.

Finally, I did inform you and Yannick in an e-mail prior to your visit in Dakar, that working with IEPF towards the further operationalization of their technical assistance package after Project approval – as I saw it -- had only limited project endorsement risks to the extent that any positive/strengthening addition would be a plus and the co-financing pressure would no longer be on UNDP-GEF's side. I was informed that IEPF wanted our assistance in operationalizing up to US\$400,000 in Technical assistance resources and I was operating under the rather strong assumption that this was in line with our discussions and agreement while you were in Dakar. If I am severely mistaken on this matter (and I know I am not), I would gladly apologize and wait for further instructions from my line management to proceed accordingly.

About UNIDO

Mathieu: The situation with UNIDO was equally discussed while you were in Dakar and I subsequently had a telephone conversation with UNIDO attended by other colleagues in the RCU so it be made clear for the record what was the common understanding reached with concrete evidence in the event that UNIDO's story would change later on. During your visit, I did explain to you that while in Vienna, it was agreed that UNIDO could have parallel execution of its own funds during Microhydro implementation. This agreement was reached in Vienna and I have double checked my understanding with Frank Pinto on June 1, 2005 per the attached e-mail record. As you are aware, I was extremely busy working around the clock to meet the processing deadlines for Microhydro with no power and no operational office during the relocation to Point E of our new RCU. Nevertheless, I took the time to ascertain the arrangements agreed to in Vienna through an e-mail addressed directly to Frank with copy to you and Yannick. Per the same attached record, my recollection was ascertained and it was clear that a parallel execution arrangement with UNIDO did emerge out of the Vienna Steering Committee Meeting in an

amount close to US\$700,000 – US\$900,000 depending upon whether one could include in-kind contribution from governments. The attached e-mail trail also documents that the idea of a field visit by the UNDP-GEF Project Task Manager was offered by UNIDO which had agreed to bear all costs for the technical field visit, as I had indicated in my e-mail that Frank did reply to. If it is now your assessment that you never had a chance to read these e-mail dating back from June 1, 2005 I can understand that under unusually challenging circumstances e-mails may fall into the crack. Please, be assured that I will fully abide by your instructions not to travel to China with UNIDO should you arrive at such a managerial decision based on the TOR sketched out in my earlier exchange with Frank. This has been an overly difficult year with promising unprecedented results in the entire history of GEF at a high human/family-work-life cost: no annual leave/home leave since I joined close to 3 years ago and I would follow your earlier suggestions for me to take some time off to care for my family. I have really enjoyed working hard and I look forward to a long career with UNDP-GEF for many more years to come. The countries are already asking for Microhydro 2 which may “sell like hot cakes” !!!

The next question that may be prompted by the attached e-mail record is why is it that the agreed parallel execution role of UNIDO's own cofinancing was difficult to be included in the project briefs while I had indicated to Frank that I needed to verify his own recollection before I proceeded further with the writing of the document ? The answer is simple. To my amazement, UNIDO came back to me on several phone calls prior to my June 17th collaboration framework memo (attached for your convenience) suggesting and pressing hard to have a full-fledged project execution role for close to US\$5 million in GEF resources in addition to their own co-financing contrary to every discussion that I was aware of. Faced with the dilemma of battling or trying to help UNIDO sort out its own “memory loss” under extreme time pressure with recurrent power outages in Dakar (I still had to get Burkina Faso and Mauritania approved with not even a Staff Assistant to help as NDEYE was not yet on board) to advance on the Microhydro Project document or lose any further opportunity to have GEFSEC consider this uniquely successful African Project with US\$5 million UNDP-Corporate core support along with close to US\$100 million in AfDB co-financing, my professional judgment was to focus on the most important deliverable. At some point you even sent me an-email indicating that I did not need to be distracted despite your ordinary fears that Microhydro was a war with GEFSEC per your own wording !!! In retrospect, I still believe that my result-based/focused approach was quite sensible for the following 2 reasons: (i) First, I have enough evidence which can be released to you verifying that UNIDO never returned my phone calls prior to the finalization of the Project documents while all I was trying to do was to give UNIDO an opportunity to agree on the appropriate language as they seem to have later turned away from the agreements in Vienna; Phone logs and further exchanges with UNIDO can document a genuine effort on my part to engage UNIDO in a constructive

discussion when nobody at the other end in Vienna seemed prepared or willing to talk to me. I did use, direct UNIDO office line, UNIDO cell contacts and even UNIDO colleagues personal home phone numbers and left messages to UNIDO counterparts who did not bother to call back before the deadline for GEFSEC submission. (ii) Second, I was not sure I had to divert further time away from the substantive PRODOC issues under finalization at the time knowing fully that I simply did not have the material time and that GEF Council approval of projects is broadly a two-pronged process with an initial Council approval and a follow-up Council endorsement which is really the final approval curving in stone the implementation/execution arrangements. It is my recollection that I politely suggested to you that all complex implementation issues be revisited and/or clarified after approval as it appeared in the approved Burkina Project that Council members would write to confirm that they expect the pre- endorsement/post approval phase to be put to good use towards further detailed implementation clarification. Based on the above, we are still consistent and truthful to UNIDO when the final PRODOC clarifies (as agreed in Vienna) that UNIDO would carry out the parallel execution of its own funding per the exchanges that I verified with Frank on June 1, 2005. You were copied on all relevant e-mail trail and it is my recollection that these matters were brought to your attention while you were in Dakar but I also realize that your workload may require that I help out every now and then as I am trying now.

I am very surprised to now suddenly see this flurry of email exchanges (from both UNIDO and IEPF), immediately after our submission of the project document (which contains no details whatsoever on their respective involvement) with all the details of cofinancing amounts and roles that I had been pressing you to provide. Before taking this any further I want to see an explanation of what is going on here.

Mathieu: Please, refer to the attached e-mail documentation and above explanation clearly indicating that all relevant information were sent out to you and that – in effect – your attention was drawn on all aspects of the above collaborative efforts. Please, take the time to make any appropriate decision and let me know accordingly. As I had warned you while you were in Dakar, all UNDP-Field Offices who talked to me lately feel that UNDP should solely executed GEF funds for this project. With ARMADA, a number of UNDP-Field Offices are even considering playing a bigger role and exploring executing AfDB resources. I honestly did explain to you that the chances of moving towards endorsement quickly are greater when the co-financing burden is upon the parallel co-financier as it is now the case with UNIDO and IEPF rather than indicating co-financing amounts in the approved initial project brief that may (or may not materialize). Marcel, I thought that you agreed and understood the operational rationale for this while you were here? I also provided further evidence to you that IEPF's co-financing for the PDF-B phase took over a year to materialize at the risk of holding back the supplemental PDF-B funds approved by GEFSEC. I supplied all ERP/ATLAS DOCUMENTS and exchanges with GEFSEC/UNDP-

Bamako together with the detailed budget execution of the PDF-B to justify the risks management efforts on my part. These 10 African countries, unlike countries from other parts of the world had little or no GEF funding since the creation of GEF in the Climate Change Focal Area. Getting them a Project approved and later cancelled because of the GEF 3-year rule if the co-financing was too slow to materialize would be considered an aberration and I am sure we both agreed while you were in Dakar that the right professional decision was made to increase the chances of GEF Council approval and quick endorsement. Again, I am glad to help refresh your memory on all of the above exchanges if necessary. The e-mail record is on file. Please, let me know if you require further clarifications. Also, I look forward to your instructions so I can follow-up accordingly.

I also note plans for you to go to China in November for a study tour, which is being presented as part of the UNIDO support/assistance to our project, but our own project is not even approved yet, let alone under implementation. I have problems following all of this.

Mathieu: Please, refer to my attached e-mail exchange with Frank dated June 1st 2005 including the short TORs sketched out based on the Vienna discussions. Also, refer to the attached collaborative framework which was sent out to you and Yannick. If it is now your managerial decision not to authorize this technical field mission, please let me know and I would cancel all travel plans with UNIDO right away. Please, be assured that I will find the right words to pass on the message to UNIDO that this was no longer feasible owing to my operational commitments at this time. Simply let me know the marching instructions here and I will follow as a good soldier.

I will not have time to discuss this in the remaining two days here in India, my schedule is packed and very dense with meetings and project development work. I do not want to be distracted from this. However, I suggest you give me your feedback by email so that we can discuss this next week when I am back.

Mathieu: Thanks Marcel for your efforts to clarify things that you may not have had time to review thoroughly under your current work load and I really look forward to continuing to help out as soon as possible and when you need me. Cheers, Mathieu

Marcel Alers
Climate Change Manager, a.i.

>



agence intergouvernementale
de la francophonie

Québec, le 22 juillet 2004

N/Réf. : nc/448/04

Monsieur Frank Pinto
Executive Coordinator
UNDP-GEF
Energy and Climate Change
New York
USA

Objet : Projet régional de Micro-centrales hydroélectriques

Monsieur le Coordonnateur exécutif,

Dans sa correspondance en date du 28 mai dernier, le représentant résident du PNUD-Bamako – Mali m'informe de la décision du Fonds pour l'environnement mondial (FEM) de financer le PDF-B du Projet régional visé en objet. Il demande, par la même occasion, le versement sur le compte du PNUD-Mali de la contribution de l'IEPF au co-financement de la phase préparatoire de ce projet.

Je me félicite de l'aboutissement heureux des efforts déployés de part et d'autre pour soumettre à temps le dossier de ce projet au FEM. Le PNUD et l'IEPF ont bien eu raison d'associer leurs efforts, somme toute complémentaires, dans cette démarche.

Je m'étonne cependant que l'IEPF n'ait jamais été officiellement saisi de ce résultat et surtout qu'il le soit par le représentant résident du Mali avec lequel il n'a jamais été en rapport pour cette affaire.

Comme nous l'indiquions dans notre correspondance du 23 juin 2003 à M. Mathieu Koumoin, Coordonnateur régional du PNUD pour les changements climatiques, après sa visite de travail à notre siège, les efforts variés d'intermédiation et de financement que nous déployons dans ce cadre s'inscrivent dans une perspective de collaboration ouverte avec le PNUD. C'est du reste dans cette perspective qu'a été élaboré un projet de memorandum définissant le cadre de cette collaboration et un portefeuille de projets conjoints autour desquels devait se construire notre partenariat.

Or, si le projet régional de micro-centrales hydroélectriques connaît aujourd'hui un début de mise en œuvre, nous n'avons aucune information sur les autres projets du portefeuille et sur le memorandum. De plus, nous ne savons pas dans quelles conditions doit s'engager la réalisation de ce projet.

Il est difficile, dans ce contexte où les bases de notre collaboration restent encore mal définies et où notre participation aux décisions concernant le projet de micro-centrales hydroélectriques est encore incertaine, d'envisager le versement de notre contribution.

C'est dans l'attente des dispositions que vous voudrez bien prendre pour faire aboutir les processus engagés et pour apporter les clarifications demandées ci-dessus que je vous prie d'agréer, Monsieur le Coordonnateur exécutif, l'expression de ma considération distinguée.

Sibi Bonfils
Directeur adjoint

p.j.
c.c. M. Mathieu Koumoin
Coordonnateur régional pour les changements climatiques
PNUD/FEM



INSTITUT DE L'ÉNERGIE ET DE L'ENVIRONNEMENT DE LA FRANCOPHONIE IEPF
56, RUE SAINT-PIERRE - 3^e étage - QUÉBEC G1K 4A1 CANADA TÉL. 1 418 692 5727
TÉLÉCOPIE 1 418 692 5644 COURRIEL iepf@iepf.org INTERNET <http://www.iepf.org>

L'IEPF est un organe subsidiaire de l'Agence intergouvernementale de la Francophonie
opérateur principal de l'organisation internationale de la Francophonie

From: Sibi Bonfils [mailto:Sibi.Bonfils@iepf.org]
Sent: Friday, January 30, 2004 6:14 AM
To: Mathieu Koumoin
Subject: Re: Version révisée des Documents Micro-Hydro

Sibi

```
> Sibi:
> Many thank for your continued support.  PLease, find the attached.
>
> Mathieu
>
>
> -----
>                                     Name: JAN-29RegMicro-HydroConcept.pdf
> JAN-29RegMicro-HydroConcept.pdf    Type: Portable Document Format
(application/pdf)
>                                     Encoding: base64
>
>                                     Name: Submit_RCUREgional_MicroPDF-
BJAN29_9.doc
> Submit_RCUREgional_MicroPDF-BJAN29_9.doc    Type: Microsoft Word Document
(application/msword)
>                                     Encoding: base64
```

RESPONSE FROM M. KOUMOIN TO M. GLEMAREC'S REQUEST FOR CLARIFICATIONS FOLLOWING IEPF'S COMPLAINTS TO FRANK PINTO

Yannick:

Welcome back and many thanks for your e-mail. Sorry that I had unintentionally blocked the review at HQ. I should provide a quick (but factually correct) answer to your questions before volunteering additional background with the hope that this would be helpful.

1. For the projects under my supervision, the answer to the question as to whether IEPF's or GEF's funds will be co-mingled is yes. In almost all of my projects where a close cooperation with IEPF is envisaged, IEPF funds are expected to be wired to UNDP. In all of the above, however, no GEF funds will be expected to be wired to IEPF on a sole sourcing procurement basis. In October 2003, when I first engaged GEFSEC on the ways in which IEPF was going to collaborate with UNDP-GEF for the preparation and future execution of the Regional Micro-minihydropower project, GEFSEC raised the issue of the status of IEPF. At the time and with Dick's input, we made the case that IEPF would act as a technical assistance entity given that the Institute's legal status is not that of a donor Agency but rather a technical Assistance, International Capacity Development body focusing on Energy and the Environment. Dick and I further insisted that because of the above, it would not be sensible to prevent IEPF from bidding on UNDP executed projects as a result of the Institute's collaboration/partnership with UNDP-GEF, particularly in instances where IEPF had a clear comparative advantage.
2. My recollection is that we agreed with GEFSEC that IEPF would have no preferential treatment and would be subject to all required internal UNDP procurement procedures for consulting services whether the Institute was directly bidding for a UNDP/UNDP-GEF service contract or whether it was acting on behalf of one of its affiliates by way of a recommendation.
3. In point 1 above, IEPF funds would and/or could flow to UNDP when resources are pulled together indiscriminately and executed as such (please, refer to the detailed example of the documented Mini-Microhydro Project PDF-B under implementation). Likewise, in point 2 GEF funds would and/or could flow to IEPF or its affiliates so long as no upfront preferential treatment is granted; i.e. selection following internal UNDP procedures and sanctioned on the basis of pure merit of the Institute. Again, here, I should like to request that you review the attached detailed example of the selection of Econoler (an IEPF affiliate Canadian Firm operating in the Energy/Environment Sector) to lead the field technical feasibility studies under execution in the context of the above mentioned project.

How did we do it ?

4. A project Steering committee including the AfDB, IEPF, UNDP-GEF, UNDP-Country Offices (and the World Bank Institute as of June 2004), made recruitment selections to UNDP-Bamako, the Lead Country Office based on an open competitive tender issued on the Energy and Environment Network and various consultations with our field offices which recommended several candidates. The recommendations of the provisional Chair on behalf of the Committee was sent to UNDP-Bamako.
5. UNDP-Bamako has its own purchase committee with its own rules and working arrangements. The Office in Bamako carried out a thorough and critical review of the recommendations made by the Project Steering Committee and invited the Regional Coordinator for Climate Change to present and argue each selection in his capacity as provisional Chairman of the Project Steering

Committee. It is expected that the September 2004 meeting of the above Ad hoc body will most likely select another Chairperson.

6. In reference to the attached minutes signed by the UNDP-Bamako purchase committee members and the Res. Rep/OIC, UNDP-Bamako agreed with the initial recommendations on the basis of the thoroughness and transparency that guided the initial recommendations made by the Steering Committee. UNDP-Bamako was not only satisfied with the outcome but underscored the quality of the selection, which will presumably yield a satisfactory PDF-B implementation.
7. The end of this “short” story is that an IEPF affiliate was among the firms selected and we would have assumed that a similar process could have led to GEF funds flowing to IEPF if the Institute had to be selected through such a competitive and transparent process. Please, review the initial recommendations by the project Steering committee, the selection criteria documenting the comprehensives of the work done by the Steering Committee together with the subsequent review and analysis carried out by UNDP-Bamako and the Econoler contract that resulted from the above exercise. I should appreciate it if you could help find out from a legal perspective if there is any objection to this to continue as planned for the Second round of the Microhydro Project and the many others under my supervision as planned.

Regards,
Mathieu

From: Mathieu.Koumoin@undp.org [mailto:Mathieu.Koumoin@undp.org]
Sent: Friday, June 17, 2005 6:10 PM
To: F.AliMohamed@unido.org
Cc: CGURKOK@UNIDO.ORG; Amacho@unido.org; yannick.glemarec@undp.org;
frank.pinto@undp.org; marcel.alers@undp.org
Subject: Superseding Collaboration Framework Letter: Regional Microhydro Project 1

Dear Fatin: Please, disregard my earlier transmission which was not finalized and not intended to go out.

I have attached a superseding note which captures our discussions and agreement on the above subject matter.

Best regards,

=====

Mathieu-C. KOUMOIN, UNDP-GEF Regional Coordinator

-----Original Message-----

From: Fatin ALI MOHAMED [mailto:F.AliMohamed@unido.org]

Sent: Thursday, June 16, 2005 2:43 AM

To: mathieu.koumoin@undp.org

Cc: Cahit GURKOK; Aloma MACHO

Subject: RE: Finalizing documents with UNIDO supported activities

Dear Mathieu,

Please find attached the requested disbursement profile of the activities to be executed by UNIDO for the duration of the project. If you have time tomorrow we can discuss it on the phone. I am leaving on mission next week for almost 2 weeks, however Monday I am still in office. It will be great if we could discuss and conclude tomorrow so that I that I could commence UNIDO internal process Monday before leaving!

À demain! Eventually before noon around 10 am Dakar Time I will call you. If not suitable for you please let me know when could I call you.

Bests

Fatin

-----Original Message-----

From: mathieu.koumoin@undp.org [mailto:mathieu.koumoin@undp.org]

Sent: Friday, June 10, 2005 11:08 PM

To: ALI MOHAMED, Fatin

Cc: MACHO, Aloma

Subject: RE: Finalizing documents with UNIDO supported activities

Thanks Fatin: I will prepare everything during the week-end just as you requested. The only addition that I would have liked to discuss with you on the phone was if you could consider including US\$80,000 in the UNIDO support earmarked for the African Microhydro Network ACTIVITIES during the forthcoming 2 years, considered to be a transitional/interim period and in which the network's technical Secretariat will be based in the Dakar UNDP-GEF Regional Coordination. This will only amount to US\$40,000 in UNIDO support to the African Microhydro Network per year over 2 years. GEF will fully fund the initial years of the Network once the Project Briefs are approved and endorsed but it is the interim funding that may request us to dig around for the Network to survive. Just give it a thought.

The second question that I had for you is the disbursement profile of the UNIDO funding activities; meaning a simple table showing how much resources you expect to spend per year on each activities for the total number of months/years that you had programmed the agreed UNIDO support. Please, be assured that on my side all clearances have been received so I can

proceed
quickly as you requested; we are really in business here and I am glad
this
worked out. Cheers, Mathieu

-----Original Message-----

From: Fatin ALI MOHAMED [mailto:F.AliMohamed@unido.org]
Sent: Friday, June 10, 2005 5:35 AM
To: mathieu.koumoin@undp.org
Cc: Aloma MACHO
Subject: RE: Addendum: Follow-up to Vienna Meeting and discussions

Hallo Mathieu, Glad you are still in office and not gone on annual leave
yet! I mean it good for our work (may be less good for you!)

The telephone line stopped and it was not possible to establish the
contact again!

Awaiting the up-dating of the Project Brief to reflect discussed issues,
it is advisable that I proceed with requesting the approval of UNIDO
project and associated funding. To meet the requirements of UNIDO
internal approval procedure, I would appreciate receiving an email from
your side reflecting the following:

1. A confirmation of the request expressed by the Steering Committee
of UNDP-GEF project calling on and welcoming close cooperation and
synergy between UNIDO and UNDP-GEF regional project. (as we do not have
a report of the Meeting yet)

2. The key activities proposed and co-financed by UNIDO will be an
integral part of the full phase UNDP-GEF project.

3. The Project Brief would reflect at the relevant places the
following:

- New components composed of activities conceived by UNIDO and
eventually the lessons learned from its implementation are to be
executed by UNIDO after the completion of UNIDO co financed package of
activities (estimated to start as soon as approved and completed by end
of the year). These new components are to be implemented in cluster 2 &
3 countries /the participating countries, to be co financed by the
UNDP-GEF regional project and executed by UNIDO.

- Under the Implementation Arrangements, it will be stated that
UNIDO will be also an executing agency / associated agency for these
activities financed by the UNDP GEF project.

- An Interagency Agreement spelling our institutional arrangements
will be signed between the parties (IA and EA) to the project.

Mathieu, I need your feedback on these matters as soon as possible to
enable catching certain (funding) momentum.

Best wishes, Fatin

-----Original Message-----

From: mathieu.koumoin@undp.org [mailto:mathieu.koumoin@undp.org]
Sent: Friday, June 03, 2005 3:20 AM
To: ALI MOHAMED, Fatin
Cc: MACHO, Aloma

Subject: RE: Addendum: Follow-up to Vienna Meeting and discussions

Dear Fatin: This looks good to me. I will try to buzz tomorrow if I can.
I like the proposed trip to China.
Best, Mathieu

-----Original Message-----

From: Fatin ALI MOHAMED [mailto:F.AliMohamed@unido.org]

Sent: Thursday, June 02, 2005 9:03 AM

To: mathieu.koumoin@undp.org

Cc: Aloma MACHO

Subject: RE: Addendum: Follow-up to Vienna Meeting and discussions

Hallo Mathieu,
Please find attached an excel file with the budget estimate associated with the activities "the 2 projects from unido perspective", for this year, projected per activity, and per budget line. please note what is already approved and what is awaiting to as well as the inserted text as comments on expected contributions.
could we talk tomorrow? when it is suitable to you?

Cheers, Fatin

-----Original Message-----

From: frank.pinto@undp.org [mailto:frank.pinto@undp.org]

Sent: Wednesday, June 01, 2005 8:57 AM

To: Mathieu Koumoin

Cc: marcel.alers@undp.org; yannick.glemarec@undp.org

Subject: Re: For your information on UNIDO co-financed activities: Follow-up to Vienna Meeting and discussions

Mathieu,

Sounds fine to me since that is what the UNIDO Managing Director Rwendiye said at the meeting. Warm regards. Frank (from Mumbai)

----- Original Message -----

From: Mathieu Koumoin <mathieu.koumoin@undp.org>

Date: Wednesday, June 1, 2005 2:35 pm

Subject: For your information on UNIDO co-financed activities: Follow-up to Vienna Meeting and discussions

> Frank:
> I refer to the discussions that we had in Vienna with UNIDO
> and the
> co-financing that Cahit's team alluded to. Based on the attached
> e-mail
> trail and unless instructed otherwise, I will go ahead with a few
> lines in
> the relevant Project Briefs to specify that UNIDO will co-finance
> (parallelco-financing) a number of activities outlined in Fatin's
> e-mail. I think
> that UNIDO is shooting for about US\$1 million but we are safer
> suggesting US\$700K-US\$800K at this time. I am glad that this is
> now clear for UNIDO
> that we are not sharing execution of GEF resources here but simply
> cross-fertilizing experiences. Fatin has also alluded to a
> possible field
> visit to China on their Center which should -- perhaps -- not be
> an issue on
> my side if all relevant travel and DSA costs would be on the
> invoice for
> UNIDO's budget for the proposed synergetic activities with UNDP-GEF
> microhydro.
>
> Hope you are recovering quickly. Mathieu from Dakar.
>

From: Tegegnework Gettu [<mailto:tegegnework.gettu@undp.org>]

Sent: Wednesday, April 26, 2006 9:55 PM

To: 'Mathieu Koumoin'

Cc: kemal.dervis@undp.org; james.provenzano@undp.org; francoise.nocquet@undp.org; 'Olav Kjørven'; brian.gleeson@undp.org; gilbert.houngbo@undp.org; jeffrey.avina@undp.org; 'Richard Barathe'

Subject: RE: Seeking an appointment with the Administrator -- Severe misconduct/Harassment case in connection with UNDP-GEF Executive Coordination's attack on the Approved GEF African Microhydro Initiative

Thank you very much for your message. I have talked and checked with all the concerned units after I received your message. The Administrator's schedule is full on the week of May 22 and he will be away on a mission on the week of May 29 to June 2nd. I would be more than happy to meet you and discuss your concern and convey it to the Administrator. I have taken note of your concern. From my consultation with the different units that have to handle this and I was properly informed and updated on the situation and you can get further explanation from them too if you wish so. However, It is the current administrations' and leadership's conviction as well as the Organization's principle and rule that no exception will be allowed to get away with offenses like you are alleging or will any investigation will be watered down. I do not think it is the intention of any one or any unit. I will assure you that this is not tolerated. Kindly note that there are proper channels, rules and regulations that investigations and investigators follow. All allegations have to be first assessed and if they are credible will be followed by formal investigation if the allegation is found to be credible. Also kindly note that there are quite a number of cases coming all over from all directions. As you know UNDP has 166 Country Offices and there are limited number of investigators with limited amount of resources and this affect the speed of investigation and outcomes. In addition since the Organization have to follow due process those who are implicated have to be handled with due process and all aspect on investigation are more complicated than simple instruction. We will explain and explore all this, if you want to, when we meet. We assure you again that all due process will be followed and no exception will be made. Regards.

Email and AIM finally together. You've gotta check out free [AOL Mail!](#)

From: Mathieu Koumoin [<mailto:mathieu.koumoin@undp.org>]

Sent: Sunday, April 23, 2006 12:54 PM

To: 'tegegnework.gettu@undp.org'

Cc: kemal.dervis@undp.org; james.provenzano@undp.org; francoise.nocquet@undp.org; 'Olav Kjørven'; brian.gleeson@undp.org; gilbert.houngbo@undp.org; jeffrey.avina@undp.org; 'Richard Barathe'

Subject: Seeking an appointment with the Administrator -- Severe misconduct/Harassment case in connection with UNDP-GEF Executive Coordination's attack on the Approved GEF African Microhydro Initiative

Dear Gettu: I refer to the attached correspondence from the Administrator dated November 11th, 2005. I am writing to seek a formal appointment with Kemal in the week of May 22nd through May 26th, 2006 in New York in the event that his schedule would permit. Alternatively, an arrangement for the proposed meeting in the first week of June (May 29th through June 2nd, 2006) would also be fine with me.

Perhaps, you may recall that – by way of an e-mail dated February 24th, 2006 addressed to UNDP-GEF Executive Coordination -- I alerted UNDP-GEF's top Management, EEG and HR Director of the urgent need to address an on-going professional harassment/abuse of authority and discriminatory treatment by UNDP-GEF Executive Coordination in the handling of our development efforts towards 20 African countries. I subsequently met with the Ombudsperson on March 15th in New York and followed-up with a formal complaint through HR/Staff Well Being Unit on March 30th, 2006. While a formal investigating committee of the admissible formal complaint filed on March 30th, 2006 should be expected to start investigating this case with 3 alleged Offenders as of April 30th, 2006 **I was officially informed by HR of its intension to consider the entire formal review process which started on March 30th, 2006 as an informal effort that may still be playing out with the Ombudsperson and I have a problem with the proposal.** Hence, this escalation so the allegations brought forward in the case that I formally filed on March 30, 2006 are: **(i)** acted upon by top Management (HR/EEG/UNDP-GEF Executive Coordination); **(ii)** fully investigated in a thorough, transparent and comprehensive manner by April 30, 2006 per established UNDP-HR Harassment Prevention Policy Guidelines/procedures; **(iii)** seized as a vivid illustration of the kind of misconduct that Kemal has actively been trying to help UNDP get rid of through is enclosed correspondence of November 2005. It is important to note that the fact that there are 3 alleged Offenders at such a Senior Level within the Institution – in my own assessment – should not water down or dilute the seriousness of the charges brought forward when these are vindicated by the evidence either internally or in a court of law at a much higher cost to UNDP as a whole.

In preparation for the proposed meeting, I will formally request a working session with RBA during the days preceding my proposed meeting with the Administrator, and I anticipate that RBA will be in touch with your Office once I receive your reply to this request. Again, the purpose of the proposed meeting is simply to inform Kemal of the compelling circumstances surrounding HR's intension to oppose due process.

Looking forward to your response.
Thanks,

== == ==
Mathieu-C. KOUMOIN, Ph.D.
UNDP-GEF Regional Coordinator for Energy and Climate Change
West and Central Africa

From: Kemal Dervis [mailto:kemal.dervis@undp.org]
Sent: Friday, November 11, 2005 4:13 PM
To: UNDP Global Staff
Subject: Workplace Harassment, Sexual Exploitation and Abuse of Authority

United Nations Development Programme
The Administrator



11 November 2005

[\[Español\]](#) [\[Français\]](#)

Dear Colleagues,

Sexual or workplace harassment and abuse of authority are betrayals of the values of the UN charter, of our commitment to respecting cultural and religious differences and equal rights for men and women. To make absolutely clear that all UN managers and staff are responsible for ensuring our work environment is free of such unacceptable conduct, UNDP has led an inter-agency team (see attached) to develop a training and certification programme on how to prevent and address these behaviours.

UNDP already has a [policy in place to address these issues](#), and this training will help ensure that all staff in our organization understand and comply with it. **Completing this training, and the certification which goes along with it, is mandatory for all staff members.** It is expected that all such staff members, including managers, be certified by the first quarter of 2006. Newly recruited staff should complete the programme within two months of when they take up their duties.

The key messages which we wish to convey through this training, and which we expect each staff member to always remember:

- We are all responsible for creating a harmonious working environment, which is free of intimidation, hostility, offence and any form of sexual harassment and retaliation.
- We all need to demonstrate sensitivity towards our fellow staff members of different cultural, religious and gender backgrounds, in keeping with the spirit of the Charter of the United Nations.
- Harassment is about impact and not intent.
- Retaliation against a person who has reported allegations of harassment, sexual harassment or abuse of authority, in good faith, will not be tolerated.

This is intended as an on-line training programme, and the instructions for how to get started can be found [by clicking here](#). However, for those locations where the connection with internet is difficult, staff will be provided with CD-roms by their learning managers.

I will hold managers accountable for the timely participation of their staff: I also expect them to set an example for their staff by receiving certification at an early date. Failure to take the course and certify will be recorded in the RCA.

The final module in this programme is specifically designed for managers since their role is essential in establishing a positive working environment in the office -- by behaving in exemplary fashion themselves; by taking responsibility to ensure all their staff have a proper work environment; and by ensuring that allegations of improper conduct are taken seriously. All staff members are welcome to take this module but only managers and supervisors are required to complete it.

The programme is now available in English, French and Spanish. It will be available in the three other official UN languages (Arabic, Chinese and Russian) in the next few weeks.

I also want to take this opportunity to remind all staff of [the Secretary-General's Bulletin on Special Measures for Protection from Sexual Exploitation and Sexual Abuse](#), which reiterates that exploitation or abuse, particularly when perpetrated against beneficiaries of United Nations' protection or assistance, constitutes serious misconduct and is therefore grounds for disciplinary measures, including summary dismissal. In addition, this policy, which applies to all staff, obliges you to report concerns or suspicions of sexual exploitation and abuse and places the onus on managers at all levels to support and develop systems that maintain an environment that prevents such conduct.

These are unpleasant issues, but we must respond to them unambiguously, to protect the core values of the UN Charter – values which we have all pledged to protect as representatives of the UN system.

Regards,

Kemal

Global Environment Facility



TO : **James Provenzano**, Director OLPS
Legal Department UNDP
304 East 45th St., Room FF-805
New York, NY 10017
Phone 1-212-906-6571
E-mail: james.provenzano@undp.org

CC : **Ms. Francoise Nocquet**, Senior Legal Adviser, Personnel
Legal Department UNDP
304 East 45th St., Room FF-812
New York, NY 10017
Phone 1-212-906-6878
E-mail: francoise.nocquet@undp.org

FROM : **Mathieu-C. KOUMOIN, Ph.D.**
Regional Coordinator, Energy and Climate Change
West and Central Africa

DATE : April 22, 2006

SUBJECT : **Formal Request for an Administrative Review/Appeal of 200 Series Fixed Term contract non-renewal of UNDP-GEF Climate Change Regional Coordinator for West and Central Africa**

By way of a letter dated March 23rd 2006 (which is enclosed for your ease of reference), I was informed by HR that my current 200 series term contract with UNDP-GEF would not be renewed. I am writing to appeal the decision made on the following grounds:

- (i) On March 16, 2006, the Executive Coordination of UNDP-GEF (Frank Pinto, Executive Coordinator, Yannick Glemarec, Deputy Executive Coordinator) informed me during a formal meeting in the Rio-Conference Room of the FF-Building that the decision **to renew or not to renew my contract would be solely based on my performance in FY05**. Although the CRG process was not completed in March 2006 when I visited headquarters (and appears to be still underway), UNDP-HR notified me on March 30th, 2006 of the abrupt decision made not to renew my contract using the Administration's discretionary powers. I am aware that, consistent with OLPS legal aids/check lists on fixed term contracts non-renewal, *where the Administration gives justification for its exercise of discretion, the reason must be supported with facts*. Please, note that the clarifications provided to me in the attached correspondence dated April 21, 2006 indicate that the CRG has not been finalized. Hence, the justification of my contract non-renewal on grounds of unsatisfactory performance in FY05 should not have preceded the final deliberation of the CRG, particularly, given the Administration's own justification which was offered in New York and documented through audio taped/CD records

of pre-RCA/post-RCA discussions with my line Manager (M. Marcel Alers). Please, note that the above audio record is available from Christine Bendel from the Staff Well Being Unit. Therefore, the reasons presented by the Administration not to renew my contracts are contradicted by the facts. **OLPS is herewith authorized to obtain copies of all prior material sent to HR/Christine Bendel in connection with this case including the above audio CDs.**

- (ii) In this case moreover, legal expectancy of my contract renewal was inferred from the following surrounding circumstances:
- (a) I submitted my FY06 business plan including activities and budgets along with the Dakar Regional Coordination's Unit Business Plan and **obtained approval from UNDP-GEF Executive Coordination for both my own technical activities and relevant FY06 budget items** at the exception of a few restrictions for the recruitment of international Consultants on only one project (The Approved GEF African Microhydro Initiative, US\$19 million in GEF grants, UNDP-Trac co-financing of US\$5 million). A formal e-mail from Yannick Glemarec confirming business plan approval by Frank Pinto was sent out in March 2006 to all relevant UNDP-GEF outposted Staff. Please, note that an additional formal reference to the above approved business plan is documented through an enclosed e-mail exchange with my line Supervisor/Marcel Alers;
 - (b) I had received a 2 rating (exceeded expectation) in FY2003 and FY-2004 consecutively and was congratulated by UNDP-GEF Executive Coordination *in May 2005 for my good job and remarkable performance with UNDP-GEF per the enclosed attachment*. At my mid-term RCA review with Marcel Alers who was on mission in Dakar in September 2005, I was informed that despite some recurrent harassment from him, to the extent that my GEF Council submissions were expected to be approved (US\$25 million in total GEF Council approvals in FY05 alone), he was confident that such unprecedented success in the Climate Change Focal Area in Africa would be reflected accordingly in my performance appraisal this year. *Based on the above assurances provided by my line Manager, I resigned in December 2005 from the African Development Bank which granted me a leave of absence without pay (during the 3 and half years that I have been serving UNDP-GEF)*, using precisely the performance record agreed with my line supervisor during my mid-term review in September 2005. Please, note that a record of this resignation from the AfDB is attached for your ease of reference as well.
 - (c) I had formally alerted UNDP-GEF Executive Coordination of several grievances and instances of harassment from Marcel Alers per an electronic correspondence to Yannick Glemarec dated February 24th, 2006 which will be sent to OLPS under a separate e-mail. As I had discussed with the Ombudsperson and UNDP-GEF Executive Coordination in mid March 2006 my grievances towards **a formal harassment complaint eventually filed on March 30th, 2006** a Managerial decision to protect me against 3 alleged Offenders – at such a high level within the Administration (Marcel Alers, Yannick Glemarec and Frank Pinto) in my harassment case was in order. I believe that **the HR provisions for the protection of complainants under retaliatory threats in documented harassment cases should be sensibly enacted.**

Thanks for your anticipated collaboration on this matter.

